

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,244	11/30/2001		Satoshi Mashima	900-409	3534
23117	7590	12/31/2003		EXAMINER	
NIXON & V			ALEJANDRO MULERO, LUZ L		
	1100 N GLEBE ROAD 8TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTO	N, VA 2	2201-4714	1763		

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$\langle \hat{A} \rangle$
Advisory Action	09/997,244	MASHIMA ET AL.	(C)
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Luz L. Alejandro	1763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars n the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 17 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply n places the applicati	to a on in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the appropunt of the fee. The appropinally set in the final O	n. See MPEP oriate extension priate extension office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	•
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a) will not be entered or by ould be rejected is provided belo	⊠ will be entered ar w or appended.	nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 6,8 and 10.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b)  disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>	
10. Other:	(	Luz L. Alejandro Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1763	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) \Z

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: regarding the rejection involving the Noriyuki reference, the rejection is maintained since the instant application is not entitled to the filing date of the parent case because the limitations in the claims of the instant application are not supported under 35 USC 112, first paragraph in the parent case. Concerning applicant's allegation of hindsight in the rejection using the Tomita reference, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).